

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/616,643	PEDERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer H. Gay	3672	
All Participants:		Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>	
(1) <u>Jennifer H. Gay</u> .		(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Walt Grollitsch</u> .		(4) _____.	
Date of Interview: <u>22 December 2005</u>		Time: _____	
Type of Interview:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
48-50			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:			
See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
 Jennifer H. Gay Primary Examiner			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant to inform him that the application was in condition for allowance except for claim 50 being dependent off of claim 45 which had been cancelled. During the course of determining from which claim, claim 50s hould depend, it was discovered that the dependency of claims 48 and 49 was also wrong. It was agreed upon that claims 48-50 should be amended to depend from claim 47..